

rules of parliamentary courtesy. She said that she took back her words, and I think the example in question was set by Members opposite. I think Members who said withdrawals should not be qualified are not exactly paragons themselves. In the case of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister indicated that the Member could have remained closer to the truth but she withdrew the expression she used, and, I think, thus complied with the Rules of the House.

[English]

Mr. Gurbin: Madam Speaker, I appreciate what you said at the beginning concerning the interventions. Those interventions had to be confirmed by *Hansard* before I could present my point of order, and this is the first opportunity since *Hansard* was printed to find out whether it was reported. There are many statements made during the course of debate which may or may not be represented in *Hansard*; therefore, we had to check on that before we could make representations.

Madam Speaker: I understand that, but if those words were heard during the course of the debate, they should be dealt with immediately. I am just warning Hon. Members that these matters should be dealt with at the time they occur. There are two conditions for disallowing unparliamentary language. The idea of disallowing unparliamentary language is because it could create some kind of commotion in the House. Obviously, if these words were not immediately heard, or did not insult the Hon. Member at the particular time, there was no commotion. However, I take the point; the language was unparliamentary. As for the prefacing, I have heard several prefacings of this nature when I pleaded five or six times for Hon. Members to withdraw certain language, which they finally did. Therefore, I have to be fair to the Hon. Minister. I have accepted it in other cases and I have to accept it in her case.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PETITIONS

MR. TAYLOR—CALL FOR REINSTATEMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): I have great pleasure in presenting a petition on behalf of some 603 Canadians living in the riding of Bow River, in the Province of Alberta. This petition requests the reinstatement of capital punishment.

This petition is from the High River-Okotoks area of Bow River constituency. Two young women were mutilated and their remains set on fire in this area and the petitioners feel very strongly that capital punishment should be reinstated for deliberately planned murder and where a person is found guilty of same beyond the shadow of a doubt. When the ultimate crime, namely murder, occurs, then the ultimate punishment, namely death, should be enacted.

Petitions

My petitioners humbly pray that the House of Commons will reflect the thinking of the majority of the people of Canada and reinstate capital punishment.

MR. MURPHY—OPPOSITION TO BILLS C-131 AND C-133

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of hundreds of Canadian citizens who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to thus present a grievance common to your petitioners, and they ask the House honourably to provide a remedy. The petition is that Bill C-133 and Bill C-131 will reduce the pensions of senior citizens through the capping of indexing of pensions of public servants and old age pensioners; and the undersigned humbly pray and call upon all Members of this House to oppose this legislation.

MR. DOMM—IMPOSITION OF METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, I have a petition with 3,699 signatures on it from people right across Canada. It comes from an organization known as "Operation Humbug", which is against forced metric. I present this petition to you, Madam Speaker. This is prompted because the petitioners who have been petitioning this House have been accused by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) of forging signatures. The signatures on this petition bear a printed name, address and signature. If this is not sufficient for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I am prepared to supply the phone numbers on the next petition.

• (1510)

I present this petition on behalf of petitioners from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. The petition says:

We oppose the imposition of the metric system and request that this system be continued on a strictly voluntary basis.

That is the same motion as in the petition presented by the 135,000 petitioners just a short time ago.

MR. SARGEANT—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by 1,714 people in Manitoba who are opposed to the Government's plans to test the Cruise missile in Canada.

Cruise missile testing has been the subject of much debate outside Parliament. In fact, on October 30, 1982, 15,000 people marched on the streets of Ottawa to protest the proposed testing of this vehicle of annihilation. Canadians have made their views clear on the steps of Parliament; they urged the Government to refuse the Cruise. Unfortunately this matter has never been debated inside Parliament. As the representative of the people of Selkirk-Interlake and as the New Democratic Party spokesperson on defence issues, I am